REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10-12, 14 and 18-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 12 and 21 are independent. By this Amendment, the independent claims are amended. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0006], [0008] and [0053] of the published U.S. application. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 12, 18 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nishide et al. ("Nishide"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0007173 A1, in view of McIntyre, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0063305 A1, and further in view of Shima et al. ("Shima"), U.S. Patent No. 6,104,489. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 is amended to clarify that the default setting sets the multiple items to values specific to a predetermined geographic location, and the default setup modifying unit modifies the multiple items of the default setting to create a modified default setting *set forth in the single default setup command* when the single default setup command is included in the printing job. Independent Claims 4, 5, 12 and 21 are similarly amended.

Nishide discloses an image processing device including a print server 12 as shown in Fig. 1 of Nishide. The print server receives a print job from a client terminal 16 (see Fig. 1 and paragraph [0079] of Nishide). However, as discussed below, Nishide discloses that default settings are created according to settings of an application name stored in the print server 12 rather than according to a setup default command specific to a predetermined geographic location, included in the print job.

In particular, when the print job is received at the print server 12, the print job is read (step 100 in Fig. 3 and paragraph [0079] of Nishide), and the name of the application which generated the page layout in the print job is extracted (step 102 in Fig. 3 and paragraph [0080]). Based on the extracted application name, *standard settings* of the printing functions are read from database files in the external memory 30 of the print server 12 (step 104 in Fig. 3 and paragraph [0081]). Then, *print job settings* are read from the *drawing commands* in the print job (step 106 in Fig. 3 and paragraph [0081]). The *standard settings* are compared with the *print job drawing command settings* to determine if there are setting changes (steps 108 and 110 in Fig. 3 and paragraph [0081]).

If there is a change between the *standard settings* stored in the external memory 30 of the print server 12 and the *print job settings* in the drawing commands of the print job, Nishide discloses that the print sever 12 changes the *print job drawing command settings* to the *standard settings*, and notifies the client terminal 16 (steps 110 and 112 in Fig. 3 and paragraph [0082] of Nishide). Thereafter, printing is carried out **on the basis of the *standard settings*** stored in the external memory 30 of the print server 12 (step 114 and paragraph [0083]). That is, Nishide discloses that default settings are created according to the settings stored in the print server rather according to a drawing command or a default command specific to a predetermined geographic location included in the print job.

Thus, Nishide fails to disclose a default setting that sets multiple items to values specific to a predetermined geographic location, and modifying multiple items of the default setting to create a modified default setting *set forth in the single default setup command* when the single default setup command is included in the printing job, as recited in Claim 1 and similarly recited in independent Claims 4, 5, 12 and 21.

Further, McIntyre and Shima fail to cure the deficiencies of Nishide. For example, McIntyre simply discloses saving printer control panel settings in a memory. Shima simply discloses a process for printing a test page. Thus, independent Claims 1, 4, 5, 12 and 21 are patentable over the combination of Nishide, McIntyre and Shima for at least the above reasons.

Claims 10, 18, 20 and 22 are patentable over Nishide, McIntyre and Shima at least by virtue of their respective dependence from the patentable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects Claims 7, 11, 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nishide in view of McIntyre and Shima, and further in view of Iguchi, U.S. Patent No. 6,963,414. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Iguchi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Nishide, McIntyre and Shima. Therefore, Claims 7, 11, 14 and 19 are patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of their respective dependence from the patentable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37

C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any

overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: <u>April 1, 2010</u>   By: <u>/WCRowland/</u>

William C. Rowland

Registration No. 30888

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620